

LITTLEFIELD, "THE NEW MAN FROM MAINE."

Washington, Littlefield of Maine is the president of the hour. He has risen rapidly from obscurity down the far eastern horizon. He is now approaching his zenith. "The New Man from Maine," as he was called when he first led the rays of his pugnacious rhetoric upon the scene of debate in the house of representatives, is to take leadership of the Roosevelt program to enact a law regulating and controlling trusts. As such coming leader he has been much talked of recently; is sure to be more talked of in the near future. There appears to be a little doubt as to his exact relationship to the president's program. At first it was announced from Oyster Bay that he had been selected by Mr. Roosevelt to take charge of the administration on legislative trusts in the national legislature. Wonder was at once expressed that the president should choose for his spokesman a man whose chief activities during his short career in Congress had been displayed in kicking over the party traces and in playing havoc with the party harness, vehicle and outfit. Then followed from Oyster Bay a second and very carefully worded announcement. Mr. Littlefield was not the chosen anti-trust leader of the administration. The administration was to have no such representative, and whatever measure it favored would be brought forward in the regular way through congressional committees and the regular house organization. Mr. Littlefield had given close study to the trust problem and his advice would doubtless have some weight. But others and the opinions of others would also be considered. Mr. Littlefield had not been summoned to Oyster Bay for a conference with the president. If any such interview was held it would be at the instance of Mr. Littlefield himself.

The truth about the affair, as it is understood here, is that some months ago the president and Mr. Littlefield talked about the trust question and about possible legislation. They found their ideas were not far apart. After the president had made his speech at Pittsburg he was asked if anything were to be done in the way of trust legislation next winter, and he replied that he hoped he that Littlefield of Maine had a pretty good bill, which he supposed would be pressed. At once the story went forth that Mr. Littlefield was to be the administration spokesman. Thus we see that the story is a half-truth. Littlefield may represent the administration in the sense that the measure he presses meets the president's views, and he may not. Their views may diverge in important particulars.

But the episode has brought Littlefield to the front. It has made him the talk of the country. There is a great deal of speculation about him and about his opinions on the trust question. Whether or not he stays at the front depends in large measure upon himself. He has been a member of Congress for some time. He has given prominence beyond his present or past importance. Can he work up to his new reputation? Can he evolve the panacea for the trust evil which his party will be willing to enact into law? Can he produce the scheme which will rally to its support the President and the Republican leaders?

Everyone must admit that it is a large contract. The man that does all this will be a genius of the first water. Littlefield will enter upon his task handicapped in some ways. His record as a "kicker" has not endeared him to a large number of his associates in the house. Big senators look askance at him. He has risen too rapidly. "The old Republican party has a code of discipline, an esprit du corps, and one of the cardinal principles of its code is that a man shall not get to the front of the procession by kicking over the traces. He is more likely to land in the ditches."

When Littlefield brings forward his panacea he must expect to encounter hyper-criticism within his own party. He will have to run a gauntlet of clubs and cudgels and knives and shilleahs. If he gets through alive he will demonstrate that he has a right to get through. He will be an incarnation of the idea of the survival of the fittest.

Aggressive Congressman Comes Conspicuously to the Front as An Anti-Trust Leader—Has Record as a Fearless Fighter—A Leader in Debate—As an "Insurrecto" He Has a Task That Will Test His Ability—Walter Wellman in Chicago Record-Herald.

He will, in that event, be a great man, a possible speaker of the house, a possible president, a real leader. He is not only a postulate, an experiment, an aspirant. The rebel may become the revolutionist and reach the throne. If he does he will show genius.

There are several things in Littlefield's favor. He has brains and courage; he is a fighter. The man who wins against such odds as confront him will need all these. If ever there was a fighter in Congress Littlefield is the man. He does not do much else but fight. Perhaps he has done too much fighting. The big boy that sets out to rule the school by cracking heads must crack a good many before he attains his ambition. He must make a wholesale job of it. He must be strong enough to command obedience, to institute a reign of terror, to play upon the timidity of his fellows and bring them to their knees. No easy job in the big school on Capitol Hill.

Charles Edgar Littlefield was born to fight. He is a fine specimen of the blue-eyed fighters who come out of Yankee land. There is a rising tradition, in vogue in many lands, that the blue-eyed man is going to rule the world; that he is conqueror of the future. Littlefield came to Congress only three years ago. At first he was known as the successor of Nelson Dingley. But he wasn't satisfied to be known as anybody's successor. He wanted to stand on his own pins. He set out to attract attention to himself. He made rapid progress.

One of the first things he did was to kick over the party traces on the Port-

to Rico question. He kicked hard, too. He made a speech which stirred his brethren of the house as they had not been stirred in a long time. He came very near routing his own people. Even the calm quiet equanimity of William McKinley was disturbed. McKinley, having in part recanted his "plain duty" message, was secretly trying to get the 15 per cent bill through. He wanted to know who was this new man from Maine that was making so much trouble.

On the question of the manner in which the American flag and Constitution were to be carried around the world Littlefield was once more a thorn in the flesh of his party associates. Here again he made a powerful speech and once more showed himself an able debater. He was sure the Constitution and flag went hand in hand. He proved it, too, to his own satisfaction at least. Even after the supreme court had decided against him he would not submit, but went out and made a speech in which he virtually said the supreme court did not know what it was talking about. It takes courage for a new congressman to flout the majority of the supreme court when it decides a great question the way his political party wants it. Littlefield has that sort of nerve. He will need it before he solves the trust problem.

It is as a debater that Littlefield shines. When he makes a speech on the floor of the house of representatives he is at his best. Imagine a big-boned, spare-fleshed Yankee about six feet long alking up and down the aisle on the Republican side. He has long legs

and long arms and a big voice. He hurls out his sentences with a force almost vicious. He appears to be always daring some one to contradict him or to ask him a question. He wears a chip on both shoulders and always wants some one to knock them off. At first a few accommodated him, and then wished they had not. Now when he speaks he is generally left alone. Few are rash enough to risk an encounter with that buzz saw from the piney woods of Maine.

Littlefield in motion on the floor is a sort of human dynamo. His voltage is high. Every motion he makes, every word he utters, indicates strength, vigor, energy—strength, vigor of both mind and body. The sentences come cracking out like three-horse hits off a swift, straight ball. The gestures are those of an athlete. As you watch him walking up and down the aisle, snapping out his words, you realize that he is full statured, able to take care of himself in any capacity, an ugly man to meet. He would do quite as well in football as in debate, and would be sure to be in the thick of things all the time.

As night succeeds day, so does it follow that such a man as this does win his way through the love his fellow men bear him. If he dominates at all, it is through sheer force. He does not know what eloquence is. Probably it would be impossible for him to appeal to the sympathies of his audience, of a court or the jury. He is too logical, too hard, for that. He has no other art than the art of hitting hard. There are no pliant pieces in his repertoire. His voice is harsh, rasping, a little draw-

ing. His gestures are those of the Maine lumberman with a cant-hook in his hand. His bodily movements are forceful, awkward, like those of one of his Rockland sailors pulling down the mainmast in a gale of wind.

As a man Mr. Littlefield has friends, of course. But most of his friends in the house are among his fellow insurgents on Porto Rico, on the Constitution and the flag, on Cuban reciprocity. With them he stood up against the elder leaders. The elder leaders admire him, fear him, but are not prone to help him. His greatest danger in his role is that his fellow members of the committee on judiciary will frown upon his efforts to secure legislation; that the speaker of the house and his lieutenants will put obstacles in the way of the man whose ambition it is to solve the trust problem.

The new man from Maine has already gained some reputation as a trust regulator. He introduced in the last Congress and reintroduced last December a measure which was regarded as rather drastic. He wanted to declare restraint of trade a crime. He proposed to provide that any person who shall be injured in his business property by any person or corporation by reason of anything forbidden in the bill shall be entitled to sue for and recover, with costs, three-fold the injury. In the bill the use of the words "person" or "persons" is defined as including corporations or associations existing under the laws of the United States.

He also proposed that any corporation manufacturing or dealing in any article in violation of the act shall be denied the use of the mails, and the railroads, steamships, and other common carriers are forbidden to transport their product from one state to another, and such product may be confiscated to the United States. This bill passed the house in June, 1900, but died in the senate.

What are Littlefield's general ideas on the trust question? They may be gleaned in part in speech which he delivered in the house two years ago, from which the following extracts are taken:

"I do not find it necessary to become delirious or hysterical over the question of trusts."

"There are aggregations of capital and corporations in this land which are legitimate and useful."

"The advantages are that the consumer today, with the peculiarity of development which exists, receives and buys his goods cheaper than he ever did before. The disadvantages are that it eliminates individual competition, and tends to sink individualism in the great aggregation of corporation."

"Where there is one aggregation which might be called a 'hydra-headed monster' there are three or four that are legitimate elements of enterprise."

"It is only when it is injuriously aggregated, it is only when it is improperly aggregated, when it crushes out or seeks to crush out competition, when it is operated to restrain trade and commerce and oppress the public, that capital becomes a proper subject of legislation, a proper subject of judicial attention."

"To establish the line of demarcation between the lawful and the unlawful corporation, aggregation or syndicate may well engage the attention of the most acute mind."

"We all recognize the fact that there are in this country organizations, aggregations, corporations, trusts, that, in their operation, tend to stifle competition, tend to materially and improperly injure in their productive capacity our people and interfere with the development of our resources."

Littlefield is a lawyer of course—a hard-headed, shrewd, successful Yankee lawyer. Success in his country—he lives at Rockland—means \$4,000 or \$5,000 a year. He has been in the Maine legislature, and served as speaker of the house. He was attorney general of his state. He was expecting to come to Congress for many years. He was a delegate to the St. Louis national Republican convention, and was an enthusiastic advocate of the nomination of Theodore Roosevelt over McKinley. He will surely come to the senate if he lives. He is 51 years old, looks younger, has no recreations but work, does not care a rap for society, and has no bad habits except a fighting fervor for his opinions and against every one who fails to agree with him. He is as sure as W. J. Bryan that he is always right, and quite as able to prove it.

ABOUT ROOSEVELT'S NEW POLICY.

It is Causing Much Uneasiness in Political Circles Throughout the Country—What Walter Wellman Says of It in Chicago Record-Herald.

President Roosevelt is looking for trouble. Probably he will get it. His selection of Littlefield of Maine as his direct representative in Congress on the trust question is sure to create no end of heart burning. It is doubtful if the selection was a wise one. Littlefield is a new man in the house, and so far he has won fame chiefly as an insurgent, as a non-conformist. So many times has he been out of touch with the majority of his party that it looks very much as if he had deliberately entered upon a course of kicking as the easiest way to attract attention to himself. He first rebelled on the Porto Rican tariff question. Then he ran up against the Supreme court with his insistence that the Constitution follows the flag. During the last winter he was one of the leaders of the anti-reciprocity Republican faction in the house and helped defeat Mr. Roosevelt's favorite policy. Littlefield has been a thorn in the sides of the older leaders of the house who reluctantly agreed to, or at least tried to do, what the president wanted as to Cuba. To have him picked out now as the administration's representative on the exceedingly important proposed legislation against trusts naturally goes against the grain of quite a number of able gentlemen.

By next winter presidential maneuvering in the Republican party will be at its height. It will then be determined whether or not there is to be opposition to Roosevelt's nomination. At the present the outlook is that he will have an easy field, but it is too early for any one to say that this condition is settled and permanent. Opportunity may spring up at any moment.

Every one now understands that the president is trying to build up a Roosevelt party within the Republican ranks. If there is to be a counter effort, an attempt to organize an anti-Roosevelt party, it will probably make itself known in opposition to the proposed trust legislation. The simple truth is that the men who really manage the Republican party in the senate and house are opposed to tinkering with the trust law. They want to let the trusts alone, and permit the problem to work itself out. A year ago the Republicans put through the house a purely buncombe bit of anti-trust legislation. During the last winter they could have passed a useful bill had they wanted to do so, but they did not want to.

Now that President Roosevelt has mapped out his plans for anti-trust legislation, it will be interesting to see what the older Republicans of the senate and house will do about it. If they fall in line and let Littlefield put his opposition to Roosevelt's nomination in an end. If, on the other hand, they block the legislative wheels and contrive to get through the short session without responding to the president's wishes, Colonel Roosevelt may about that time consult his political almanac and read: "Look out for snails!"

The young president has put his powerful shoulders behind two legislative problems:

1. Cuban reciprocity.
2. Anti-trust legislation.

With the first he is likely to meet great success. As to the second, time will tell. It will not be necessary for the Republicans, who wish to beat

ever to be traded away. Will the president incur the risk of being charged with insincerity by leading a campaign for a new anti-trust law while failing to use the existing law against one of the worst monopolists that, in anthracite coal? Will he incur the same risk by making no move against the steel trust (where it is obvious the law is inapplicable) and at the same time failing to go after the steel trust in the one practical way that is open—by cutting off the 35 per cent protection which it enjoys and which enables it to wring profits out of American consumers at the rate of \$12,500,000 a week? These are some of the problems which thinking men here are taking into consideration in their effort to reach a judgment about the success and failure of Colonel Roosevelt's leadership of his party.

They admit that all the indications are in his favor; at the same time they insist that there are dangers in the road.

NATION'S EYES ARE ON OYSTER BAY.



The eyes of the whole nation are now turned towards Oyster Bay, New York, where the president of the United States is spending his well earned vacation in the bosom of his family. For the time being President Roosevelt, chief executive of the United States, has to give way to Colonel Roosevelt, family man and father of a horde of merry, laughing youngsters. Day by day the news columns tell of the light-hearted, boyish delight the president is taking in his holiday and the temporary laying aside of the dignity of office. "He is the biggest child of them all," Mrs. Roosevelt recently affectionately declared of her distinguished husband. The above authentic snapshots made by our special photographer show President Roosevelt and his family as they show themselves to the natives of Oyster Bay. It will be observed that the family group looks like any other happy American family trying to get as much enjoyment as possible out of the vacation months.

A UTOPIAN SCHOOL FOR THE SONS OF MILLIONAIRES

How Music, Art, Refinement and High Ideals Are Taught by Women Professors to the Twelve Pupils at Helicon Hall in Englewood, N. J.

Twelve boys, with eleven teachers, five of whom are attractive young women.

A school where there are no rules, no prizes, no monitors, no "exams," and where the energies of the teachers are devoted to cultivating the pupils in the finer sentiments and in art and beauty.

Such is the educational Utopia reared by John W. Craig at Englewood, N. J., in a spot of beauty where the surroundings appeal to the artistic and aesthetic senses, already awakened by the "voices of the trees" and all the other moving charms of nature.

Helicon Hall was designed to accommodate a round dozen of boys; it will never be any larger, the head master says. It is a costly building of stone, unique in its architecture without and within; costly in its varied advantages, and, naturally, to be enjoyed only by the sons of men able and willing to pay for the gifts it provides.

Mr. Craig met with severe criticism from experts in pedagogy when he constructed a fact—his hall—out of a dream. It was said that his scheme was too luxurious, that it would weaken the spirits of the boys and make them too effeminate.

"While boys in many another school are cutting up high links in dormitories at night, are clandestinely out on larks or smoking and drinking on the sly—acquiring 'manly' attributes, as it were—the boys of Helicon Hall sit about one of the oddest open fireplaces ever conceived and chat with the preceptors.

Sometimes they are rehearsing a Greek or Roman play or listening understandingly to an artist's interpretation of Bach, Beethoven or Wagner. Often in the way of a lighter amusement they play billiards or bowl or have a rifle practice at a target.

Perhaps they go to the city to see a drama enacted. In the morning they may have talked on board a clipper ship just in from Japan and examined the cargo from the far-away port.

Results are the proof of wise and good works, and so, after seven years, Mr. Craig points to the twelve happy, healthy and thoughtful boys about him now; to those of his flock who are in the big universities, and asks if they are not youths in whom the highest promise of the nation is exemplified.

"Give me a boy of six and I will tell you what his future will be," said the creator of Helicon Hall yesterday to a writer for the Monthly World Magazine.

"If I take the boy at twelve I cannot so well foresee his future. Nevertheless, his latent senses can be awakened and he can be made fit to meet the problems of life."

At Helicon Hall the ideal and the material meet on common ground. The son of the merchant, who is to follow in his father's footsteps, and the patrician lad with inherent bent for a profession, both play the violin or the piano, both appreciate the beauties and technicalities of sculpture and painting; follow with trained ears the elusive theme of a symphony.

Each, too, is studying spelling, geography, mathematics, grammar, the languages, history, natural science and other of the truly practical courses of instruction.

For physical training there are for both the canonic of the muscles, baseball, football and all of the other outdoor sports.

The curriculum is simple and not especially different from that of other good schools. Believing in the importance of music, in the simple and correct beauty with which he has surrounded his pupils, Mr. Craig has finally conquered all antagonism, and there are

now many who follow him in a greater or less degree.

The fifteenth century supplied the model for Helicon Hall. It is in many of its physical and spiritual aspects a copy of the life and form of a famous villa of the century of Poggio Bracciolini, where the princes and nobles of the time were educated by a man whose modern prototype is the head master of Helicon Hall.

"I was reading Symonds' 'Renaissance of Italy' in 1887," said Mr. Craig, "and in the part devoted to the revival of learning I learned of the work of Vittorino da Feltri, first of Venice and then of Padua, who established his ideal of a training school for boys."

"I had long been thinking on the problem, not content with present methods, which made of education a drudgery. I closed the book and told a friend a few moments later that my mind was made up. Helicon Hall is the realization of the impulse created by de Feltri's work."

Mr. Craig's theory is that a boy's interest must be stirred before a study appeals to him. The pupils are not taught a geography and told to learn from it so many lines, to be repeated from memory next day. This is drudgery.

In their visits to the ships and marts the products of foreign countries are examined and talked about with persons who know where and how they grow or are produced.

The interior court of the hall, a tropical garden, with banana trees, palms of many varieties, or towering rubber tree, a fountain with fish there where it falls, lizards, a monkey, an African elephant's head, tusks and trunk suggests in itself many far away climes.

Once a boy becomes curious about the product of a country or its people he naturally wants to know where the country is and its geographical relation to his own home.

Thus led along, he studies geography because he wants to know and not because he is told he must know, and so it is with every other study.

A boy is not excused from any study because of a disinclination for it proceeding from laziness, but he may, after observation, show such an incapacity for some particular course of study that to continue him at it would be a sheer waste of time and energy.

The basis of the instruction is individual work, and the classes, except in exceptional cases, contain only from two to five pupils.

There is no class room in the ordinary sense. The boys study and are instructed at small tables scattered over the interior area opening into the tropical court. They look up to the rich tropical verdure, the fountain and their other pleasant environments. The whole atmosphere is one of charm and peace.—New York World.

TRUTHS TERSELY TOLD.

Unreasonableness begets unreasonableness.

Neither labor nor capital can do its best while in the spirit of defiance or hostility to the other.

Are you quite sure how you would act if you were in the other fellow's place?

Arrogance sows the seeds of its own undoing.

One excuse is as good as another if you are really looking for trouble.

Nursing grievances make them grow. Holding a good workman down to the level of a poor one injures the good.

Good money and bad money could be put on a par, but only by lowering the value of the good.

Some think before they speak. Others act and speak without thinking. Where votes and voices rule the latter are likely to govern.

There are so many ways of doing things and only one way that is best. Still we learn to do by doing.